



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/990,876

11/23/2001

Robert Lafleur

10442-8"US" JA/lm

2200

20988

7590

08/25/2004

OGILVY RENAULT  
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3  
CANADA

EXAMINER

LE, THANH TAM T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/990,876	Applicant(s) LAFLEUR, ROBERT	
	Examiner Thanh-Tam T. Le	Art Unit 2839	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The RCE that filed on 5/11/04 is acknowledged.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (5,772,453) in view of Szeto (6,375,495) and Sung (6,518,961).

Tan et al., figures 4A and 4b, disclose a computer motherboard-mounted graphics card (100) having at least one I/O connector, the card comprising:

- a connector footprint (108) capable of receiving a USB connector and positioned on the graphics card adjacent to a vertical edge of the card;
- another connector footprint (106) capable of receiving D-sub connector (70) and positioned on the graphics card behind the USB connector footprint; and

Tan et al. disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for the DVI and the HD-15 connectors mounted with pins in a selected one of the DVI and HD-15 connector footprints.

Szeto, figure 5, discloses an expansion card (100) having a DVI connector (10). Sung, figure 2, discloses an adapter device (30) having a D sub-connector (36), which is composed of a HD15 connector (Sung, column 3, lines 23-25). It would have been

Art Unit: 2839

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Tan et al. 's the USB connector and the D-sub connector with Szeto's DVI connector and Sung's HD15 connector, in order to connect more than one type of connectors.

Regarding claim 2, Tan et al. and Sung disclose the HD-15 connector is selectively connected to the HD-15 connector footprint and has a correspondingly horizontally elongated body.

Regarding claim 4, it is noted that Szeto, figure 5, discloses the vertical edge having a lower cut-out.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Tan et al., Szeto and Sung disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for a second I/O connector mounted with pins in a third footprint positioned on a lower portion of the computer card near the lower cut-out.

The instant invention does not give any reasons or problems to be solved by having a second I/O connector mounted with pins in a third footprint positioned on a lower portion of the computer card near the lower cut-out. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Tan et al. to have a second I/O connector mounted with pins in a third footprint positioned on a lower portion of the computer card near the lower cut-out because more than one connectors or footprints would serve the same purpose.

4. Claims 3, 7 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al., Szeto and Sung as applied to claims 1-6 above, and further in view of Fabian et al. (5,080, 609).

Art Unit: 2839

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Tan et al., figure 4A, disclose the I/O connector comprising a first pair of card mounting members (56) positioned vertically on each side of the pins. Tan et al. fail to disclose a third card-mounting member positioned closer to the vertical edge.

Fabian et al., figure 14, disclose a boardlock (14 which read on a third card mounting member). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tan et al. to have the boardlock as taught by Fabian et al., in order to provide accurately mount between the card and the connector.

Regarding claims 17-21, the features in the method claims are identical to those in the apparatus claims. Therefore, the method of manufacturing motherboard-mounted computer graphic cards alone is not a patentable feature.

5. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (5,772,453) in view of Szeto (6,375,495).

Tan et al., figures 4A and 4B, disclose a computer motherboard-mounted card having at least one I/O connector, the card comprising:

- two footprints positioned one behind the other (106 and 108) for accommodating two different output types (70 and 10) and positioned at an upper portion of the computer card; and
- one right-angle, vertical edge, I/O connector mounted with pins in a selected one of the two footprints.

Tan et al. disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for the vertical edge having a lower cut-out.

Szeto, figure 5, discloses an expansion card (100) having a lower cut-out. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tan et al. to have the lower cut-out as taught by Szeto, in order to reduce cost and manufacture.

Regarding claim 9, Tan et al. and Szeto the instant claimed invention as described above except for a third footprint.

The instant invention does not give any reasons or problems to be solved by having a third footprint. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Tan et al. to have a third footprint because more than one footprints would serve the same purpose.

Regarding claim 10, two sets of connector mounting member receiving holes (102) provided in the computer card.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Tan et al. disclose a second I/O connector.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. and Szeto as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Sung (6,518,961).

Tan et al. disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for the second I/O connector is an HD-15 connector.

Sung, figure 2, discloses an adapter device (30) having a D sub-connector (36), which is composed of a HD15 connector (Sung, column 3, lines 23-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Tan et al. to have the HD15 connector, as taught by Sung for power consumption and manufacturing can be reduced (Sung' abstract).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh-Tam T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2094. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TC Patel can be reached on 571-272-2098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TL.  
08/22/04.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
T. Le